



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/964,097	09/26/2001	Craig Andrew Bayliss	JP920000296US1	3011	
23550	7590 12/22/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	WARNICK & D'AL	PESIN, BORIS M			
	3 E-COMM SQUARE ALBANY, NY 12207		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			2174		

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/964,097	BAYLISS ET AL.
navioury nation	Examiner	Art Unit
	Boris Pesin	2174
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (c)	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for replying later than three months after the ma	rg date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP FR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note l	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	•
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10. Other:		Bustine Zincaid KERTINE KINCAID
	SUPE TE	RVISU SYCOCOMISER CHNOLOGY CL., LITTLE

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's arguments.

The Applicant argues:

- (a) Stephens' system does not display the different categories (groups/clusters) in different manners, i.e. controls, and does not select a manner of display (control) based on whether nature of the information in a category meets a threshold set for the nature.
- (b) There is no threshold about either the width or the height of a block in Stephens' invention.

In regards to argument (a), Stephens' system does display different categories in different manners. The fact that the sizes of the clusters are different for all the groups is indicative of different styles of display. Furthermore the manner is selected based on the nature of the information (i.e. "The clustering algorithm determines each group based on one or more categories of information, such as a combination of "size and date" and "same author and price". The clustering algorithm also separates each group of documents into a set of sub-groups of documents having similar attributes." Column 8, Line 30)

In regards to argument (b), there is a threshold element that determines the width and the height of the box (i.e. "The width of the blocks in each stratum represents the relative number of records in the cluster represented by a block. Thus, the wider a block is, the more records it includes. Additionally the height of a block indicates the relative number of records contained in that block's stratum. These height and width indicators provide another visual cue of the distribution of the documents according to the various categories for which information is available, and allows the user to visually determine which cluster is likely to contain relevant information." Column 9, Line 21-31)..